UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,275	01/20/2000	Thomas R Eames	P722CONT	4219

27833 7590 07/08/2004

TECHNOLOGY, PATENTS AND LICENSING, INC.
6206 KELLERS CHURCH ROAD
PIPERSVILLE, PA 18947

EXAMINER	
CHUNG, JASON J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2611	20

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/488,275	EAMES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason J. Chung	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 May 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-27 and 29-85* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-27 and 29-85* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/17/04 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 31-39, 42, 43, 45, 47, 71, 73-75, 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth (US Patent # 6,286,142) in view of Schultheiss (US Patent # 6,208,384).

Regarding claim 1, Ehreth discloses having a plurality of television sets in each of a plurality of remote sites 104 (column 2, lines 59-67 and column 3, lines 1-10), which meets the

limitation on having televisions in at least two separate locations. Ehreth discloses a television set 100 located by itself, which reads on a first television close in proximity; and remote site 104, which reads on a second television remotely located (figure 1). The examiner incorporates this interpretation of close in proximity and remotely located hereinafter for the rejected claims in the Office Action.

Ehreth discloses the user may enter user input information to the channel selector and signaling unit 50 through a remote selector 70, the unit 50 communicates with the communications controller 30 (residential gateway) via network 90 (column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-12). Ehreth discloses remote selector transmits information sends user input information to the channel selector and signaling unit 50 and sends the upstream signals to upstream signaling receiver 80 associated with the communications controller 30 (residential gateway) (column 4, lines 13-23).

Ehreth discloses the multiple site video distribution system receives video information from a telecommunications network and the communication controller transmits selected video signals from the video information onto a video signal distribution network; the channel selector and signaling unit sends user input information to the communication controller (residential gateway) over the video signal distribution network and the communication controller selects the appropriate video signal in response to the user input information (column 1, lines 44-60); Ehreth discloses the network 40 provides requested data and video signals or all data and video signal to the multi-site location 102 (residential environment) (column 3, lines 15-23). Ehreth discloses the broadband/narrowband network receives the data and the video signal for distribution to the television sets 100 through communications controller (residential gateway) and the

communications controller sends all or only those video signals requested by the communications controller 30 (column 3, lines 10-34). Ehreth discloses the bi-directional arrow from the upstream signaling receiver 80 and the network interface32 (figure 1). Thus, the channel select command is sent from the user's remote control 70 to the channel selector and signaling unit 50, upstream on network 90, to the communications controller 30, and the communications controller receives the appropriate signals from the broadband/narrowband network 40, which meets the limitation on receiving a video signal from a telecommunications network in response to received at least one channel select command.

Ehreth discloses the signals received at the network interface 32 conducts ATM cell management and the ATM cells carry MPEG encoded video (column 3, lines 23-34), which meets the limitation on constructing from the video signal at least one series of video packets corresponding to a channel select command.

Ehreth discloses the network interface 32 converts the MPEG encoded video into an analog format (column 3, lines 23-34), which meets the limitation on transporting a series of video packets over a video packet bus to at least one video decoder.

Ehreth discloses the communications controller 30 includes network interface that conducts ATM cell management and generation activities and further converts ATM cells carrying MPEG encoded video to an analog format (column 3, lines 23-34); in MPEG, which meets the limitation on constructing, transporting, and decoding. Ehreth discloses the downstream signals sent from the communications controller to the television are analog (column 3, lines 35-50), which meets the limitation on transmitting.

Ehreth fails to disclose the receiver is a wireless receiver, which receives wireless channel select commands directly from at least one remote control device associated with a respective television. Schultheiss discloses the personal computer may receive cable, Internet, or satellite signals (column 7, line 63-column 8, line 2). Schultheiss discloses the process of selecting television channels (column 6, lines 4-40). Schultheiss discloses the personal computer may control the tuning and other the functions according to the second embodiment (column 6, lines 63-67). Schultheiss discloses the second embodiment may be used for figure 2 to select channels using the remote control (column 7, lines 35-50). Schultheiss discloses the remote control sends signals to the personal computer (residential gateway) and the personal computer transmits the remote control signals and the video signals to the television (column 8, lines 3-16; figure 4), which meets the limitation on received within the residential gateway, wherein the receiver is a wireless receiver which receives wireless channel select commands directly from the at least one remote control device associated with a respective television. Schultheiss discloses adding computing power would increase the cost of the television (column 1, lines 30-40). Schultheiss discloses it is an object of the invention to provide additional services without costly add on units without requiring memory and computing power added (column 1, lines 46-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ehreth to have a receiver in the gateway that receives channel change commands directly as taught by Schultheiss in order to provide additional services without requiring costly add on units to be added.

Regarding claims 2-4, as disclosed in claim 1 rejections, the video information received is ATM cells carrying MPEG encoded video and it is converted into analog at the network

interface 32 and sent to televisions downstream, the encoded MPEG is decoded into an analog signal and sent to the television.

Regarding claim 6, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Schultheiss discloses a UHF remote sending UHF signals to a UHF receiver.

Regarding claim 10, as disclosed in claim 1 rejections, the encoded MPEG signal is decoded and converted into analog; the MPEG decoder reads on a main video decoder.

Regarding claim 11, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses a decoder. Ehreth fails to disclose an insertable decoder. The examiner takes Official notice that insertable cartridges are notoriously well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to make the decoder insertable in order to provide mobility to the decoder by being able to interchange the decoder in multiple gateways in different locations.

Regarding claim 13, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses the encoded MPEG video signal is converted into analog and sent downstream; the analog signal is sent to the remote site 104, which represent different parts of a residential dwelling and comprises a television (column 2, lines 59-67 and column 3, lines 1-10), which meets the limitation on a television in close proximity.

Regarding claim 15, Ehreth discloses televisions (plurality of devices) connected to channel selection unit 50 [network 90 and channel selection and signaling unit 50 (connectors)] are connected to communication controller (residential gateway) (figure 1). Ehreth discloses the user enters user input information using remote selector 70 and the information is sent to communications controller 30 (residential gateway) via unit 50 and network 90 (column 3, lines

65-67 and column 4, lines 1-23). Ehreth discloses in response to the desired channel selection the upstream signaling receiver receives video information and transmits the video information downstream to the appropriate television set (column 4, lines 44-62); there are a plurality of televisions and the viewer can watch different programming than another viewer watching a separate television, the MPEG packets for the different programs (different formats, first and second) are decoded in different formats and sent to the viewers in close proximity of the residential gateway and remotely located from the residential gateway.

Regarding claim 31, the limitations in claim 31 have been met in claim 1 rejection. Ehreth fails to disclose the receiver is a wireless receiver, which receives wireless channel select commands directly from at least one remote control device associated with a respective television. Schultheiss discloses the personal computer may receive cable, Internet, or satellite signals (column 7, line 63-column 8, line 2). Schultheiss discloses the process of selecting television channels (column 6, lines 4-40). Schultheiss discloses the personal computer may control the tuning and other the functions according to the second embodiment (column 6, lines 63-67). Schultheiss discloses the second embodiment may be used for figure 2 to select channels using the remote control (column 7, lines 35-50). Schultheiss discloses the remote control sends signals to the personal computer (residential gateway) and the personal computer transmits the remote control signals and the video signals to the television (column 8, lines 3-16; figure 4), which meets the limitation on received within the residential gateway, wherein the receiver is a wireless receiver which receives wireless channel select commands are received directly from the remote control device by the receiver without transmission through an active electronic device. Schultheiss discloses adding computing power would increase the cost of the television

(column 1, lines 30-40). Schultheiss discloses it is an object of the invention to provide additional services without costly add on units without requiring memory and computing power added (column 1, lines 46-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ehreth to have a receiver in the gateway that receives channel change commands directly as taught by Schultheiss in order to provide additional services without requiring costly add on units to be added.

Regarding claim 32, the limitations in claim 32 have been met in claim 12 rejection, Ehreth discloses a network connecting a communication controller 30 (residential gateway) to a television (figure 1). Neither Ehreth nor White discloses the network being wired cable. The examiner takes Official Notice that wired networks and/or sending S-video via cable to televisions is notoriously well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of White to have cable in order to insulate transmitted signals without interference from signals in the air.

Regarding claim 33, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses multiple TVs and both Ehreth and Schultheiss discloses the commands are channel select commands. Schultheiss discloses the remote control transmits signals to the personal computer (residential gateway) from other rooms in the home (column 8, lines 17-28), which meets the limitation on selecting channel includes selecting a television channel for remotely located televisions by programming associated wireless remote control devices transmitting the channel select command as wireless signals to the residential gateway, the wireless signals being received by a wireless receiver within the residential gateway.

Regarding claim 34, the limitations in claim 34 have been met in claim 6 rejection.

Regarding claims 35-39, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Schultheiss discloses transmitting channel select commands. Ehreth discloses the user inputs into the channel selector and signaling unit 50 through a remote selector 70 and the user input information is transmitted on video signal distribution network 90 and information signals includes video channel selection, which meets the limitation on selecting a television channel for remotely located televisions by programming associated remote control devices to transmit channel select command to remotely located televisions; remote selector 70 uses infrared radiation (column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-12). **Ehreth discloses even though shown as a separate unit, the television set 100 and channel selector and signaling unit may be incorporated within or integrated into television set 100** (column 3, lines 2-3). Ehreth discloses the user input information is transmitted upstream to communications controller 30 (residential gateway) (column 4, lines 13-24). Ehreth discloses the channel selector and signaling unit receives (optical receiver) user input information entered by a user from remote selector (column 4, lines 17-19).

Regarding claim 42, the limitations in claim 42 have been met in claim 10 rejection.

Regarding claim 43, the limitations in claim 43 have been met in claim 11 rejection.

Regarding claim 45, the limitations in claim 45 have been met in claim 13 rejection.

Regarding claim 47, the limitations in claim 47 have been met in claim 15 rejection.

Regarding claim 71, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, the television 100 not within 104 reads on the first television located in close proximity and the televisions in remote area 104 read on the second television being a remote television (figure 1). The limitation for the receiver directly receiving selections has been met in claims 7-8 rejections. Ehreth discloses televisions (plurality of devices) connected to channel selection unit 50 [network 90 and channel selection

and signaling unit 50 (connectors)] are connected to communication controller (residential gateway) (figure 1). Ehreth discloses in response to the desired channel selection the upstream signaling receiver receives video information and transmits the video information downstream to the appropriate television set (column 4, lines 44-62), which meets the limitation on the video processor that produces a first television signal and a second television signal each associated with their respective TVs.

Regarding claim 73, Schultheiss has met the limitation for directly receiving a wireless remote control command and Ehreth has met the limitation on second television in claim 1 rejection.

Regarding claims 74-75, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses ATM cells being in an encoded MPEG format and the communications controller 30 (residential gateway) performs digital to analog conversion, which meets the limitation on constructing. As disclosed in claim 71 rejection, there are multiple viewers that can watch different programs, which meets the limitation on simultaneously decoding several MPEG streams corresponding to different channels.

Regarding claim 77, the limitations in claim 77 have been met in claim 15 rejection, the different formats in claim 15 are for different televisions.

2. Claims 7, 8, 40, 41, 67, 69, 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Hamlin (US Patent # 5,574,964).

Regarding claims 7-8, Ehreth discloses the remote selector 70 may be used in any other suitable signal transmission media for entering user input information (column 4, lines 5-12). As disclosed in claim 1 rejections, Schultheiss discloses the personal computer (residential gateway)

directly receiving the remote control commands. Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses a wireless receiver in the residential gateway receiving infrared signals from a remote control. Hamlin discloses the system controller (residential gateway) (column 5, lines 17-21). Hamlin discloses the receiving unit 46 can be a TV in the same room as the system controller 38 (residential gateway) (column 4, lines 27-33; figure 1). Hamlin discloses a remote controller sends electromagnetic signals such as infrared signals to a transceiver (receiver) connected to the system controller 38 (residential gateway) (column 6, lines 8-17); the signal is directly sent to the transceiver, which is part of the gateway. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to have the residential gateway have a wireless receiver receiving electromagnetic signals such as infrared signals or radio signals from a remote control as taught by Hamlin in order to provide versatility, mobility while communicating with the gateway.

Regarding claims 40-41, the limitations in claims 40-41 have been met in claims 7-8 rejections.

Regarding claim 67, the limitations in claim 67 have been covered in claims 1, 7, and 8 rejections. Schultheiss has met the limitation on without passing through an active device has been met in claim 16 rejection.

Regarding claim 69, the limitation in claim 69 have been met in claims 7-8 rejections.

Regarding claim 72, the limitations in claim 72 have been met in claims 7-8 rejections.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Martin (US Patent # 5,500,691).

Regarding claim 9, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses the remote and local televisions and channel select commands corresponding to each television. As disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Schultheiss discloses the personal computer (residential gateway) receiving signals from the remote controls. Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses two different types of receivers within the residential gateway. Martin discloses the satellite receiver 12 (residential gateway) receives infrared signals from RF/IR remote unit 16 and can receive RF signal via RF antenna 20 (column 3, lines 4-15, figure 1); the user can communicate remotely with the satellite receiver (residential gateway) **directly** (incorporated hereinafter in corresponding claims) via IR/RF, the user can communicate in proximity via RF or IR. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to have two types of receivers as taught by Martin in order to give the user more versatility on the type of communication to use. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to have two types of receivers as taught by Martin in order to give the user more mobility for the user to communicate from nearby or remote. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Hamlin to have two types of receivers as taught by Martin in order to give the user a more robust system in the scenario of one receiver breaks down, the other will work.

4. Claims 12, 44, 68, 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of White (US Patent # 5,596,373).

Regarding claim 12, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses an MPEG signal is converted into an analog signal. Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses S-video. White

discloses the decoded MPEG signal is an S video signal (column 4, lines 4-14). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss produce a television signal having an S video format as taught by White in order to produce better picture quality.

Regarding claim 44, the limitations in claim 44 have been met in claim 12 rejection. As disclosed in claim 1 rejection, there are a series of ATM cells in MPEG format (packets).

Regarding claim 68, the limitations in claim 68 have been met in claim 12 rejection.

Regarding claim 78, the limitations in claim 78 have been met in claim 12 rejection.

5. Claims 14, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Bindlish (US Patent # 5,608,864).

Regarding claim 14, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses a MPEG decoder. Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses decoding with three separate channels. Bindlish discloses the composite video signal is decoded by MPEG decoder into a YUV signal (three separate channels) (column 3, lines 48-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to have the MPEG decoder decode the composite video signal into a YUV signal as taught by Bindlish in order to produce better picture quality, which produce component signals (3 separate channels).

Regarding claim 46, the limitations in claim 46 have been met in claim 14 rejection.

6. Claims 16-23, 25, 26, 30, 48, 50-52, 57, 58, 60, 62-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Nguyen (US Patent # 5,515,511).

Regarding claims 16, 19, and 25, the limitations in claim 16 have been met in claim 1 rejection. Schultheiss has met limitation for directly receiving without active device has been met in claims 1 and 31 rejections. As disclosed in claim 1 rejections, Ehreth discloses MPEG signals are converted into analog signals, which meets the limitation on a main MPEG video decoder. Ehreth discloses a network interface 32 (network interface module) that receives video signals from a telecommunications network (column 3, lines 11-34). Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses a plurality of processors. Nguyen discloses a C box (residential gateway) provides conversion of digital to analog with (column 1, lines 59-65). Nguyen discloses a plurality of decompression and analog network adapters 111-114 (processors or decoders) that transmits compressed digital streams and converts the stream into analog and sends to a user (column 3, lines 38-59). Nguyen discloses advantages in overcoming prior art include being able to support more end users (column 1, lines 18-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to have a plurality of processors for decoding as taught by Nguyen in order to distribute the load of decoding among multiple decoders in order to provide video to multiple users.

Regarding claim 17, the limitations in claim 17 have been met in claim 2 rejection.

Regarding claim 18, the limitations in claim 18 have been met in claim 3 rejection.

Regarding claim 20, the limitations in claim 20 have been met in claim 33 rejection.

Regarding claim 21, the limitations in claim 21 have been met in claim 6 rejection by Schultheiss.

Regarding claims 22-23, the limitations in claims 22-23 have been met in claims 7-8 rejections.

Regarding claim 26, the limitations in claim 26 have been met in claim 11 rejection.

Regarding claim 30, Ehreth discloses televisions (plurality of devices) connected to channel selection unit 50 are connected to communication controller (residential gateway) (figure 1). Ehreth discloses the user enters user input information using remote selector 70 and the information is sent to communications controller 30 (residential gateway) via unit 50 and network 90 (column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-23). Ehreth discloses in response to the desired channel selection the upstream signaling receiver receives video information and transmits the video information downstream to the appropriate television set (column 4, lines 44-62); there are a plurality of televisions and the viewer can watch different programming than another viewer watching a separate television, the MPEG packets for the different programs (different formats, first and second) are decoded in different formats and sent to the viewers in close proximity of the residential gateway and remotely located from the residential gateway. As disclosed in claim 16 rejection, Nguyen discloses a plurality of decoders. The limitations for an insertable decoder have been met in claim 11 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claims rejections.

Regarding claim 48, the limitations in claim 48 have been met in claims 1 and 16 rejection. Additionally, Ehreth discloses televisions (plurality of devices) connected to channel selection unit 50 [network 90 and channel selection and signaling unit 50 (connectors)] are connected to communication controller (residential gateway) (figure 1). Ehreth discloses a network interface 32 (network interface module) that receives video signals from a

telecommunications network (column 3, lines 11-34). Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses a plurality of processors. Nguyen discloses a plurality of decompression and analog network adapters 111-114 (processors or decoders) that transmits compressed digital streams and converts the stream into analog and sends to a user (column 3, lines 38-59). Nguyen discloses advantages in overcoming prior art include being able to support more end users (column 1, lines 18-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Schultheiss to have a plurality of decoders as taught by Nguyen in order to distribute the load of decoding among multiple decoders and provide to more end users.

Regarding claim 50, the limitations in claim 50 have been met in claim 1 rejection.

Regarding claim 51, the limitations in claim 51 have been met in claim 6 rejection by Schultheiss.

Regarding claim 52, the limitations in claim 52 have been met in claim 35 rejection.

Regarding claim 57, the limitations in claim 57 have been met in claim 10 rejection.

Regarding claim 58, the limitations in claim 58 have been met in claim 26 rejection.

Regarding claim 60, as disclosed in claims 1, 10 rejections, the television standing outside of remote site 104 reads on close in proximity, the main video decoder is disclosed in claim 10 rejection.

Regarding claim 62, the limitations in claim 62 have been met in claim 30 rejection.

Regarding claim 63, Schultheiss discloses a UHF transceiver 24 (remote control module) (figure 4).

Regarding claim 64-65, Ehreth discloses converting digital to analog of video signals as disclosed in claim 1 rejection. Ehreth fails to disclose the received signals being voice and data. The examiner takes Official Notice that conversion of voice to telephony and data to computer is notoriously well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth to have the signals converted be voice and data in order to provide analog signals to the devices.

Regarding claim 66, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, data is sent downstream from broadband network 40 to the communication controller 30 (residential gateway) the user uses a remote to select programming and the requests are sent upstream and the upstream signaling receiver receives the appropriate programming (figure 1), the communication controller 30 (residential gateway) performs the function of a DAVIC module connected to the network and transmitting the signal to the TVs.

7. Claims 24, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Nguyen in further view of Martin.

Regarding claim 24, the limitations in claim 24 have been met in claim 9 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claim 56, the limitations in claim 56 have been met in claim 9 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Nguyen in further view of White.

Regarding claim 27, the limitations in claim 27 have been met in claim 12 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

9. Claim 29, 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in view of Nguyen in further view of Bindlish.

Regarding claim 29, the limitations in claim 29 have been met in claim 14 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claim 61, the limitations in claim 61 have been met in claim 29 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

10. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of White.

Regarding claim 49, the limitations in claim 49 have been met in claim 32 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

11. Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Nguyen in further view of Hamlin.

Regarding claim 53, the limitations in claim 53 have been met in claim 7 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claim 54, the limitations in claim 54 have been met in claim 8 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claim 55, the limitations in claims 7-8 rejections. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

12. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Hamlin in further view of Nguyen in further view of White.

Regarding claim 59, the limitations in claim 59 have been met in claim 44 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

13. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Nguyen in further view of White.

Regarding claim 70, as disclosed in claim 1 rejection, Ehreth discloses decoding the MPEG signal and producing an analog signal; the limitation on a processor and a module (plurality of decoders) has been met in claim 16 rejection by Nguyen. The limitation on S video has been met in claim 12 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

14. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Decker (US Patent # 6,167,443).

Regarding claim 76, Ehreth discloses modulator 34 for modulating the television signals (figure 1 and column 3, lines 40-50). Neither Ehreth nor Schultheiss discloses a plurality of modulators. Decker discloses an entertainment and information system (residential gateway) that is installed in a hotel with a number of rooms and TVs (column 4, lines 45-53). Decker discloses modulators 135 (figure 2, column 4, lines 54-67 and column 5, lines 1-5). The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

15. Claim 79-82, 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Hamlin in further view of White.

Regarding claim 79, the limitations in claim 79 have been met in claim 1 rejection. Additionally, the limitation for close in proximity and remotely located have been met in claim 1 rejection. The network interface module has been met by Ehreth in claim 16 rejection. The limitation for S video has been met in claim 12 rejection. The limitation for optical receiver has

been met in claim 7-8 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claim 80, the limitations in claim 80 have been met in claim 73 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claims 81-82, Ehreth has met the limitations in claims 81-82 in claim 74-75 rejections. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Regarding claim 85, the limitations in claim 85 have been met in claim 11 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

16. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Hamlin in further view of White in further view of Decker.

Regarding claim 83, the limitations in claim 83 have been met in claim 76 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

17. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehreth in view of Schultheiss in further view of Hamlin in further view of White in further view of Nguyen.

Regarding claim 84, as disclosed in claim 48 rejection, Nguyen discloses a plurality of decoders (modules). Ehreth discloses remotely located televisions in claim 1 rejections and MPEG in claim 19 rejection. The motivation is the same for this rejection as the corresponding claim rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason J. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 305-7362. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew I. Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JJC

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER